

**Single Family Design Guidelines Update  
Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Update**

**Steering Committee**

**Meeting #6 Notes  
August 13, 2004**

**Steering Committee members:** Chair Dianne Channing, Vice Chair Brian Barnwell, Bruce Bartlett, Vadim Hsu, Joe Guzzardi (attending for Claudia Madsen), Charmaine Jacobs, Bill Mahan, Helene Schneider, Richard Six.

**Staff:** Bettie Hennon (City Planner), Heather Baker (Project Planner), Jason Smart (Intern).

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

**II. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**  
None.

**III. Administrative Items**

**IV. Review of Previous Steering Committee Motions**

The Steering Committee and public reviewed the draft definitions of “mass,” “bulk,” “scale,” “massing” and “volume” approved at the June 11 Steering Committee meeting. Public commenters included: Jenifer Moore, Eric Schott and Sally Sparr. Public comment topics included:

- Usability and livability of unenclosed and uncovered spaces.
- How to include courtyards in calculations of apparent volume.
- Potential use of “bulk” as a finding for modifications.
- Need for definition of “immediate neighborhood” to capture pattern of development and built environment.

**Motion** (by Charmaine Jacobs): Revise the tentative definitions of “bulk,” “scale” and “volume” as follows. Discard the definition of “mass.” Also, these definitions will be further defined in the Draft Updated Single Family Design Guidelines using graphics and lists of structural element examples that affect volume, bulk and scale.

- **Volume:** A building’s quantitative three-dimensional measurement of the building’s height, width and depth combined.
- **Bulk:** The qualitative readily visible composition and perceived shape of a structure’s volumes. [Note: Be sure to illustrate bulk specifically: how height, setbacks and stepbacks affect bulk.]
- **Massing:** The arrangement of the building’s bulk, including relative openness and solidity.
- **Scale:** Building elements and details as they proportionally relate to each other and to humans. [Note: Scale comparison to other

buildings will be considered through the words “compatibility” and “neighborhood.”]

**2nd:** Helene Schneider.  
All in favor.

Regarding draft square footage calculation methods approved at the June 25 Steering Committee meeting, the Steering Committee agreed that more refinement of net, gross and floor to lot area ratio definitions will be needed as part of the Issue Paper D: Floor to Area Ratio and Lot Coverage discussions.

## **V. Building Height Calculation Methods**

Staff presentation was followed by Steering Committee and public discussion. Public commenters included Sally Sparr. Building height public comment included concern regarding architectural projections that tower above ridgelines.

**Motion** (by Charmaine Jacobs):

- Discard Issue Paper C: Building Height Calculations Study Option 2 due to disadvantages of measuring from the top of a building.
- Further explore Issue Paper C: Building Height Calculations Study Options 3, 4 and 5:
  - **Option 3:** Return to original definition; however, rather than not counting the height above the finished plate height, measure from lowest grade point to maximum building height.
  - **Option 4:** Consider a different maximum building height for ridgeline or steeply sloped properties.
  - **Option 5:** Enact hillside spillover maximum grading regulations which would improve height appearance of stepped structures.
- A goal of hillside building height regulations will be to limit hillside spillovers.
- Height regulations should address “apparent height” of structures
- Consider whether current plan check methods are sufficient to measure height at all points on a lot.
- Consider using “approved natural grade” vs. “natural grade” for measuring project heights.
- Consider development standards for architectural projections, e.g. chimneys and towers.
- Further consider how structure placement is handled by the NPO for hillside lots.
- Consider different height calculations or maximums for pitched roofs.

**2nd:** Bill Mahan.  
All in favor.

## **VI. Continued Discussion of Grading and Slope Calculation Methods**

The Steering Committee and public resumed discussion. Public commenters included Sally Sparr. Grading public comment topics included impacts on neighborhoods from trucks importing and exporting fill or cut for project grading.

**Motion** (by Richard Six): Accept the following grading calculation definitions:

- **Grading:** Any activity which involves the physical movement of earth material, including any excavating, filling, stockpiling, movement of material, compaction of soil or creation of borrow pits.
- **Import Fill:** Earth material acquired from an off-site location for use in grading on a site.
- **Export Cut:** Earth material transported off-site.
- **(Re)Compaction:** The densification of earth material by mechanical means.
- **Cut:** (1) An excavation. (2) The difference between a point on the original ground and a designated point of lower elevation on the final grade. (3) The material removed in excavation.
- **Earth Material:** Any rock, natural soil and/or any combination thereof.
- **Excavation:** Any activity by which earth, sand, gravel, rock or any other similar material is dug into, cut, quarried, uncovered, removed, displaced, relocated or bulldozed.
- **Fill:** (1) A deposit of earth, sand, gravel, rock, or any other suitable material placed by artificial means; any act by which earth, sand, gravel, rock, or any other suitable material is placed, pushed, dumped, pulled, transported or moved to a new location above the natural surface of the ground or on top of the stripped surface. (2) The difference in elevation between a point on the original ground and a designated point of higher elevation on the final grade, as measured in a vertical plane.
- **Stockpiling:** The accumulation of earth material in one location.

**2nd:** Brian Barnwell.

All in favor.

**Consensus** to accept the presented grading and slope calculation portion of the draft development application statistics form.

The Chair also allowed a public comment regarding an item not on the agenda at the request of Eric Schott at the end of the meeting. Mr. Schott commented that the projected NPO adoption date of November 2005 raised concerns for him regarding interim projects.

## **VII. Review Upcoming Schedule**

## **VIII. Adjourn**